



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,436	03/21/2006	Robert A. Macina	DEX0477US.NP	6995

32800 7590 06/14/2006

LICATA & TYRRELL P.C.
66 E. MAIN STREET
MARLTON, NJ 08053

EXAMINER

ZHOU, SHUBO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,436

Applicant(s)

MACINA ET AL.

Examiner

Shubo (Joe) Zhou

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction/Election Requirement

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 16 in part, and 18 in part, drawn to polynucleotides, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.1 and 24.1.
- II. Claims 11-12, 16 in part and 18 in part, drawn to a polypeptide, classified in Class 530, subclass 300.
- III. Claim 13, drawn to an antibody, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.
- IV. Claim 7 and 15 in part, drawn to a method of determining the presence of a cancer using a polynucleotide, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- V. Claims 14 and 15 in part, drawn to a method of diagnosing a cancer using polypeptides, classified in class 435, subclass 4 or 7.1.
- VI. Claim 17, drawn to methods of treating a cancer patient using polynucleotide or polypeptide, classified in Class 514, subclass 2 or 44.

The inventions of groups I-VI are independent/distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons.

The polypeptide of group II and the polynucleotide of group I are patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Polypeptides, which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of purine and pyrimidine units, are structurally distinct

Art Unit: 1631

molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. Furthermore, the information provided by the polynucleotide of group I can be used to make a materially different polypeptide than that of group II. In addition, while a polypeptide of group II can be made by methods using some, but not all, of the polynucleotides that fall within the scope of group I, it can also be recovered from a natural source using biochemical means. For instance, the polypeptide can be isolated using affinity chromatography.

For these reasons, the inventions of groups I and II are patentably distinct. Furthermore, searching the inventions of groups I and II together would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, the search of the polypeptides and the polynucleotides are not coextensive. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. In cases such as this one where descriptive sequence information is provided, the sequences are searched in appropriate databases. There is search burden also in the non-patent literature. Prior to the concomitant isolation and expression of the sequence of interest there may be journal articles devoted solely to polypeptides which would not have described the polynucleotide. Similarly, there may have been "classical" genetics papers which had no knowledge of the polypeptide but spoke to the gene. Searching, therefore is not coextensive.

The polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons:

While the inventions of both group II and group III are polypeptides, in this instance the polypeptide of group II is a single chain molecule that functions as an enzyme, whereas the polypeptide of group III encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polypeptide of group II and an antibody of group III is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptides that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the polypeptide. In this case, the polypeptide of group II is a large molecule which contains potentially hundreds of regions to which an antibody may bind, whereas the antibody of group III is defined in terms of its binding specificity to a small structure within the polypeptide. Thus immunization with the polypeptides of group II would result in the production of antibodies outside the scope of group III. Furthermore, an antibody of group III would not specifically bind all of the polypeptides of group II. Therefore the polypeptide and antibody are patentably distinct. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group II and group III would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody which binds to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of group III. Furthermore, antibodies which bind to an epitope

of a polypeptide of group II may be known even if a polypeptide of group II is novel. In addition, the technical literature search for the polypeptide of group II and the antibody of group III are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

The polynucleotide of group I and the antibody of group III are patentably distinct for the following reasons. The antibody of group III includes, for example, IgG molecules which comprise 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the 6 complementarity determining regions (CDRs). Polypeptides, such as the antibody of group III which are composed of amino acids, and polynucleotides, which are composed of nucleic acids, are structurally distinct molecules; any relationship between a polynucleotide and polypeptide is dependent upon the information provided by the nucleic acid sequence open reading frame as it corresponds to the primary amino acid sequence of the encoded polypeptide. In the present claims, a polynucleotide of group I will not encode an antibody of group III, and the antibody of group III cannot be encoded by a polynucleotide of group I. Therefore the antibody and polynucleotide are patentably distinct. The antibody and polynucleotide inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Furthermore, searching the inventions of group I and group III together would impose a serious search burden since a search of the polynucleotide of group I would not be used to determine the patentability of an antibody of group III, and vice-versa.

The invention of Group I and the invention of group IV or VI are related as product and distinct processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with

Art Unit: 1631

another materially different product or (2) the products claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acids of Group I can be used in the process of group IV, i.e. to determining the presence of cancer in an individual, or the process of group VI, i.e. treating a cancer patient. Or alternatively, the nucleic acids of Group I can be used in making recombinant polypeptides in vitro, making transgenic organism in vivo or being used in antisense technologies, e.g. inhibiting gene expression in vivo, which are all distinct usages of such nucleic acids.

The invention of Group II and the invention of group V or VI are related as product and distinct processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the products claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group II can be used in the process of group V, i.e. to determining the presence of cancer in an individual, or the process of group VI, i.e. treating a cancer patient, which are distinct processes because they comprise different steps and produce different results.

The invention of group I or III and V are unrelated because the product of group I or III is not disclosed as capable of being used or otherwise involved in the process of group V.

The invention of group II or III and IV are unrelated because the product of group II or III is not disclosed as capable of being used or otherwise involved in the process of group IV.

The invention of group III and VI are unrelated because the product of group III is not disclosed as capable of being used or otherwise involved in the process of group VI.

The inventions of groups IV, V and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the processes of groups IV-VI use different steps, reagents and produce different results. Thus, they do not overlap in scope, are not obvious variants, and the inventions as claimed have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect.

Because these inventions are independent/distinct for the reasons given above and have different classifications, they have acquired a separate status in the art, and are usually published separately in the literature, and their search would not be coextensive. Thus, there would be a serious search burden if they were examined together. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on patentably distinct sequences. Each sequence is patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid sequence. For an elected Group drawn to nucleotide sequences, the Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04). It is noted that the multitude of sequence submissions for examination has resulted in an undue search burden if more than one nucleic acid sequence is elected, thus making the previous waiver for up to 10 elected nucleic acid sequences effectively impossible to reasonably implement.

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions with the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. Examination will be restricted to only the elected sequence.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR § 1.143). Applicant is reminded that a fully responsive communication will comprise a proper election of a group and sequence as set forth above. Examination cannot proceed without a complete response.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the**

patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shubo (Joe) Zhou, whose telephone number is 571-272-0724. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang, can be reached on 571-272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Shubo (Joe) Zhou, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner

